

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,808,224 to Kato in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,267,600 to Song. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Song, further in view of Ogawa, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,328,272 to Kuramochi.

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of independent Claim 1, this claim is patentable over Kato and Song. In the rejection of Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Kato teaches various elements of the RF Karaoke data receiving pack of Claim 1, but only directly identifies two elements of Kato to be compared with elements of Claim 1. More specifically, the Examiner compares the modulator 36 and the packet circuit 35 of Kato with the waveform shaping unit and serial communication interface, respectively of Claim 1. Since the modulator 36 and the packet circuit 35 of Kato are included within the data loader 2 of Kato, it appears that the Examiner is comparing the data loader 2 of Kato with the RF Karaoke data receiving pack of Claim 1.

However, regarding the limitation, “a receiver Micro-Controller Unit (MCU) connected to an external computing device having a computing function and a sound processing function, the receiver MCU controlling an internal operation of the RF Karaoke data signal receiving pack while transmitting the digital voice signal and key data signal to the external computing device,” the Examiner cites column 7, lines 35-50 of Kato without providing any explanation. (Office Action, page 2). This cited passage of Kato does not refer to elements within the data loader 2 of Kato, but to a UART 22 included within a Karaoke player 1 of Kato. More specifically, the Examiner has failed to specifically identify what if anything in Kato, that the Examiner compares to the receiver MCU, the key data signal, the external computing device, or the transmission of

a digital voice signal and key data signal of Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully maintained that Kato does not teach, disclose, or suggest any of these elements, and that the Examiner has failed to specifically assert that Kato teaches each of these elements. Song does not cure the deficiencies of Kato.

Further, regarding the limitation, “a serial communication interface transmitting the digital voice signal and key data signal to the external computing device under a control of the receiver MCU”, the Examiner merely asserts that Kato teaches a serial communication interface, without addressing the remainder of this limitation. More specifically, the Examiner compares the packet circuit 35 of Kato with the serial communication interface of Claim 1. However, Kato does not teach that the packet circuit 35 transmits a digital voice signal and a key data signal to an external computing device under a control of a receiver MCU, and therefore cannot be compared to the serial communication interface of Claim 1. Therefore, Kato does not teach, disclose, or suggest the above-quoted limitation of Claim 1. Song does not cure the deficiencies of Kato.

For at least the reasons stated above, Kato and Song do not teach, disclose, or suggest, alone or in combination, all of the limitations of independent Claim 1. Therefore, independent Claim 1 is patentable over Kato and Song. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of independent Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Regarding §103(a) rejection of independent Claim 6, this claim is patentable over Kato and Song. As an initial matter, it is noted that Claims 1 and 6 are grouped together in a single rejection. However, Claim 1 is directed to an RF Karaoke data receiving pack, while Claim 6 is directed to a Karaoke system including a data receiving pack, as well as other elements including a wireless microphone device, an optical disk, and an audio device. As stated in MPEP §707.07(d), “A plurality of claims should never be grouped together in a common rejection, unless that rejection is equally applicable to all claims in

the group.” However, the combined rejection of Claims 1 and 6 fails to specifically address the limitations of Claim 6 in the form presented in Claim 6, and therefore, fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to Claim 6.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that any subsequent Office Action should separately address the limitations of each claim, in order to provide Applicant an opportunity to clearly understand and address the merits of the rejection of each claim. It is also requested that any subsequent Office Action not be made final.

Regarding the limitation, “an optical disk for storing a Karaoke system operating program executed and read by the external computing device, song data and background image data,” the Examiner asserts that Kato teaches this limitation at column 1, line 54-column 2, line 2, and column 12, lines 5-28. (Office Action, page 2). However, regarding the first passage cited by the Examiner, this passage in columns 1 and 2 of Kato refer to an optical disk in a Background of the Invention section of Kato that is not included in any of the devices described in the remainder of Kato. Further, Kato does not teach, disclose, or suggest that the optical disk includes a Karaoke system operating program executed and read by an external computing device or background image data. Meanwhile, column 12 of Kato includes no reference to an optical disk. Therefore, Kato does not teach, disclose, or suggest the above-quoted limitation of Claim 6. Song does not cure the deficiencies of Kato.

Further, Kato and Song do not teach, disclose, or suggest all other features of Claim 6 described herein with respect to independent Claim 1, for at least the same reasons as independent Claim 1. For at least the reason stated above, all of the claimed features of independent Claim 6 are not taught or suggested by the combination of Kato, Furukawa, and Ogawa or by either reference alone. Therefore, independent Claim 6 is patentable over Kato and Song. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of

Claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5 and 7-8 are dependent claims, and are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons given above with regard to their respective independent Claims 1 and 6.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-8 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant(s)

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, PC
290 Broadhollow Road, Suite 210E
Melville, New York 11747
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475